



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/676,138	09/30/2003	Scott William Pathakis	1565.057US1	6419
21186 7590 04/24/2007 SCHWEGMAN, LUNDBERG, WOESSNER & KLUTH, P.A. P.O. BOX 2938 MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402			EXAMINER HOMAYOUNMEHR, FARID	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2132	
SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE		MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
3 MONTHS		04/24/2007	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.		Applicant(s)	
	10/676,138		PATHAKIS ET AL.	
	Examiner		Art Unit	
	Farid Homayounmehr		2132	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 30 September 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-34 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-34 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 30 September 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>multiple</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claims **1-34** have been examined.

Information Disclosure Statement PTO-1449

1. The Information Disclosure Statement submitted by applicant on 9/30/2003 and 1/24/2005 have been considered. Please see attached PTO-1449

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

3. Claim 11 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

- 3.1. Claim 11 recites the limitation "the intercepting". There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

Art Unit: 2132

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

5. Claims 1 and 2 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Banks (US Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0140225, filed 2/15/2002).

5.1. As per claim 1, Banks is directed to a method for generating temporarily assigned identity information (abstract, as a clientID is issued for the duration of a session), comprising:

authenticating identity information associated with a request received from a requestor for accessing a service (parag. 10, where the purchaser is the requestor);

generating temporarily assigned identity information for the requestor (the clientID generated by the Home Provider (intermediary computer) when a session is started as described in parag. 17. Note that the clientID is temporary as it is assigned per session (see parag. 44));

updating a protected identity directory with the temporarily assigned identity information (The home provider computer saves the clientID such that it can be mapped to the ePerson ID (permanent identity) as shown in parag. 79. Therefore the home provider creates a directory for the mapping. Also see parag. 45, describing how the clientID is removed from the directory at the end of a session);

and transmitting the request and the temporarily assigned identity information to the service on behalf of the requester (parag. 12 or claim 1 item c, where the purchase requests and the generated temporary ID (ClientID) is submitted to a vendor),

wherein the service accesses the protected identity directory with the temporarily assigned identity information to authenticate the requestor for access (parag. 13, where the vendor authenticates the requestor by submitting the credentials to the home provider, which includes the directory).

5.2. As per claim 2, Banks is directed to the method of claim 1 further comprising: generating a mapping between the identity information and the temporarily assigned identity information; and storing the mapping in a local identity mapping store (see response to claim 1 and parag. 79).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claims 3-34 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Banks as applied to claims 1 and 2 above, and further in view of Gupta et al. (US Patent No. 6,868,448, filed 3/12/1999).

7.1. As per claim 3, Banks is directed to the method of claim 2. Banks also suggests using distributed directory services. For example, parag. 63 teaches a home provider system (computer 3) system operated as a cluster farm. Therefore Banks teaches

distribution of the identity directory in several different systems. Synchronizing the local identity mapping store and the mapping with one or more additional local identity mapping stores was a well known attribute of distributed directory services systems at the time of invention. However, Banks does not explicitly discuss the mentioned attribute.

Gupta teaches a Directory Service (col. 16 line 42 to col. 17 line 14), which replicates data (entries) in several directory services distributed in different geographical areas. Gupta also teaches local application servers, which perform authentication and store the related identity information (col. 7 lines 12 to 25). The identity information stored at the local servers is automatically updated when the information at the remote server is updated. Therefore, Gupta teaches synchronizing the local identity mapping store and the mapping with one or more additional local identity mapping stores.

Gupta and Banks are analogous art, as they are both related to locating and providing data, resources and services to users in a distributed network. At the time of invention, it would have been obvious to a person skilled in art to deploy the distributed directory service taught by Gupta in the system of Banks to allow access to user authentication data in a distributed network. One motivation to do so would have been balancing the load of directory servers as suggested in Gupta col. 18, line 3 to 47.

7.2. As per claim 4, Banks and Gupta are directed to the method of claim 1 wherein the generating further includes assembling an aggregate identity configuration for the

requestor from one or more authoritative identity stores before generating the temporarily assigned identity information (Banks parag 79, where the ePersonID is the aggregate identity information).

7.3. As per claim 5, Banks and Gupta are directed to the method of claim 1 further comprising, removing the temporarily assigned identity information from the protected identity directory after detecting a terminating event that terminates the authenticity of the temporarily assigned identity information (Banks parag. 44 and 45).

7.4. As per claim 6, Banks and Gupta are directed to the method of claim 5 further comprising recycling a storage space occupied by the temporarily assigned identity information for use in a subsequent iteration of the method (re-use of the space previously occupied by deleted data is standard practice in computer systems).

7.5. As per claims 7-9, Banks and Gupta are directed to the method of claim 1 further comprising: detecting dynamic changes made on at least a portion of the identity information, wherein the changes are detected within the protected identity directory; and synchronizing the temporarily assigned identity information and other local identity stores with the changes and logging the changes (see response to claim 3. It is well known in distributed directory systems to detect a change, update the information in the main and other local directory services and log the event).

Art Unit: 2132

8. Limitations of claims 10-34 are substantially the same as limitations of claims 1-9 above, and the following notes.

8.1. Claim 21 requires the identity information to include at least one of an identification, a password, a certificate, a token, a biometric value, a hardware value, a network connection value, and a time value. Banks parag. 78 shows the identity information includes an identification.

8.2. Claim 23 requires temporarily assigned identity information is randomly or deterministically generated. Per Banks parag. 75, the clientID is generated randomly.

8.3. Claim 29 requires the mapping is cached and accessible for subsequent uses. Gupta col. 11 lines 42 to 55 shows caching the data for subsequent use.

8.4. Claims 33 and 34 require direct or indirect access of the service to data store. Banks parag. 47-49 teaches different combination of architectural elements, which allows the service provider to directly or indirectly access the directory service.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Farid Homayounmehr whose telephone number is 571

Art Unit: 2132


272 3739. The examiner can normally be reached on 9 hrs Mon-Fri, off Monday biweekly.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gilberto Barron can be reached on (571) 272-3799. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Farid Homayounmehr

Examiner

Art Unit: 2132



Benjamin E. Lanier
Examiner AU 2132